

## **The Harold Schnitzer Family Program in Judaic Studies Guidelines and Procedures For Merit Evaluation**

Updated May 22, 2014

These are the guidelines and procedures in effect for Officers of Administration, Tenure Track Faculty, and Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF) as well as the subcategory of Visiting Assistant Professor Faculty employed by the University of Oregon through the Harold Schnitzer Family Program in Judaic Studies.

The Program Director assumes responsibility for examining the files and making recommendations for those program members who are eligible for merit salary increases. The Program Director considers in his or her recommendation the Basic Principles of Compensation for Instructional Faculty approved by the UO Senate on March 29, 2000 and all such principles that have been approved since that time. The Program, through its designee, the Program Director, will uphold all points in the United Academics bargaining contract when in-force. The Program and its designee, the Program Director, will administer faculty raises in accordance with the University of Oregon's valued principles of transparency, fairness, and equality.

In the case of faculty with joint appointments, salary increases are governed by these guidelines if the salary is paid using Judaic Studies funds. In such cases, the Program Director solicits input from the other units involved. For joint faculty appointments whose department home is different from Judaic Studies and whose salary is paid from the department, salary increases are determined by the department with input from Judaic Studies.

All faculty will be evaluated for merit; faculty are not permitted to opt out. Regardless of type of appointment or FTE, each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating. Faculty will be notified of their raises after they have been approved.

### **Officers of Administration**

The Judaic Studies Program is a member of the Humanities Consortium, which shares one Officer of Administration among five academic units. The Director of the Judaic Studies Program will provide input on the performance of the OA to the Director of the Humanities Consortium, who is responsible for carrying out the review.

### **Tenure Track Faculty**

Currently, all tenure track faculty in Judaic Studies have their tenure home in another academic department. Merit review will be undertaken in the tenure department with input from the Director of Judaic Studies.

### **Non-Tenure Track Faculty (and Visiting Assistant Professor faculty)**

## Guidelines

1. Faculty are evaluated according to the job description set forth in their contracts and Offer letters. Generally, the focus for NTTF is primarily on teaching with the possibility of some service components. For Visiting Assistant Professors, the job description is often similar to that of other assistant professors in the Humanities. The areas of activity are usually weighted in the following manner:

	<u>Teaching</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Service</u>
NTTF	95%		5%
NTTF – Visiting Asst Prof	50%	40%	10%

2. Merit is defined for these purposes as performance that meets or exceeds expectations in the categories listed above. Faculty are ranked on a scale of: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations.

3. Evaluation of teaching.

- a. Each faculty member will submit **course syllabi** and a **statement** of his or her teaching: courses taught, currently teaching, and plan to teach; pedagogical goals; types of assessment used in courses; overall grade spread; problems in classroom and how addressed; curriculum building and evaluation when appropriate.
- b. The Program Director evaluates the statement and syllabi along with numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed student course evaluation comments, classroom visits by tenured faculty, and teaching materials where available.
- c. Instructors are expected to show:
  - i) Conscientious execution of assigned courses
  - ii) Timely preparation of course syllabi with clear course objectives
  - iii) Timely evaluation of students
  - iv) Evidence of providing for student progress in line with curriculum objectives and standards
  - v) Collegiality toward colleagues and professionalism toward students
- d. Merit would be demonstrated by such things as:
  - i) a teaching record in which student and peer evaluations attest excellence in teaching
  - ii) developing additional materials for courses
  - iii) evidence that courses are regularly updated
  - iv) evidence that in the performance of teaching and advising duties the faculty member is especially diligent and responsive to students.

- Evaluation of service.

- a. If appropriate, the faculty member submits a **statement** about his or her service work. Service may include serving on committees within the unit, college, or university; union work; advising students; helping to plan conferences or other

events. Service may also include community events, courses, or lectures or participation in one's profession or professional organizations.

- b. The Program Director reviews this statement and other supporting documentation that may be applicable (letters from professional organizations, etc.). In addition, the Program Director, at his or her discretion, will follow up with committee chairs or others in positions of leadership in order to ascertain the nature, competency, or level of this service.
- c. Instructors are expected to participate responsibly in service within the department, including such things as:
  - i. Participate in program activities such as cultural events
  - ii. help cover classes for other instructors as needed
- d. Merit would be demonstrated by such things as:
  - i. evidence of additional service – ad hoc work, tasks performed at short notice – that demonstrates a level of commitment to good Departmental citizenship that is above average
  - ii. developing materials and/or resources for program-wide use
  - iii. program promotion, such as organizing events (e.g., FLIS Language day; Film series; "Arabic Day" event, conversation hour, etc.); developing program literature (posters and brochures; facebook pages, etc.)
  - iv. committee work/outreach with other departments, or outreach in the community
  - v. preparing or helping with fellowship or grant proposals
- e. It is understood that such evaluations will also take into account the opportunities for service, and that merit evaluations are not intended to work against faculty members who did not have such opportunities.

## 1. Evaluation of research.

- a. Visiting Assistant Professors and Career NTTF who have research responsibilities submit a **statement** of their research to-date, their progress, and the research they plan to accomplish in the future. Faculty members will also submit a current copy of the **C.V.**
- b. The Program Director reviews the C.V. and the statement and seeks out the advice and assessment of tenured faculty in the academic field that matches that of the faculty person, if different from the Director's academic field.
- c. Assessment of merit is based on a profile that indicates ongoing research activity and evidence of a sustained program of and for publication. The primary evidence of research by faculty will be their ability to share with others the results of their work. This will be determined primarily by the quantity and quality of publications in recognized journals or publication houses. A secondary consideration will be presentation of papers to interested groups (e.g., papers delivered at conferences, other universities, public lectures, colloquia, or campus groups outside the Judaic Studies).

- d. The Program has no set quantitative measure for annual performance and, in general, it values quality over quantity. The Program acknowledges that there are many factors affecting scholarly rhythms from year to year. Of greater importance than quantity is the contribution of the faculty member's work to scholarship, research, or continuing discussion of issues in her or his field, or related fields.
- e. The types of publications, publishers, and ranking of journals, etc. conform to the standards set in the faculty member's respective field of study.

### **Procedures**

1. The Program Director will consider performance reviews of the NTTF during the relevant period using the NTTF Merit Evaluation form found on CASweb.
2. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Program Director will conduct such a review to evaluate the NTTF's performance of duties and responsibilities according to the job description found in the offer and the contract. As the basis for this review, the Program Director will solicit from the NTTF an up-to-date c.v. and a short statement (1-2 page) on her/his responsibilities and activities for the relevant period.
3. The Program Director will also review the faculty member's quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations for every course, peer teaching evaluations, and other relevant material. The Program Director will write an evaluation based on these materials.
4. The Program Director will meet with the faculty member to discuss her/his performance and any aspect of the materials that is not clear. If there are relevant documents that the Program Director or the faculty member feels are necessary for the review, these are agreed upon and a date by which these should be submitted is settled upon. The faculty member has the opportunity to include a written response, if he/she desires.
5. In consultation with a member of the executive committee, the Program Director ranks the faculty member according to the scale listed above (Guideline 2) and determines a recommended percentage increase.
6. The Program Director will submit the merit increase recommendation to the CAS dean when requested. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.
7. Once approved by the appropriate Dean, the Program Director meets with the faculty member to go over the review and the ranking.
8. All records pertaining to the merit pay increase review process (the Program Director's recommendations, statements of justification, any adjustments, dean's approval) will be kept on file in the office of the program, accessible for review from the Program's OA.
9. Appeals may be made to the Program Director or to the Dean; cases can also be grieved through United Academics.